

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/576,946	Applicant(s) DAYON, ALEXANDRE	
	Examiner Hieu c. Le	Art Unit 2142	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Alexandre Dayon.

(3) Andrew Caldwell.

(2) Horace Ng.

(4) Hieu c. Le.

Date of Interview: 17 February 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: Demonstration of web pages embodying claimed invention.

Claim(s) discussed: Claim 1,4-5, 29-31.

Identification of prior art discussed: of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



ANDREW CALDWELL
UNITED STATES PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The rejection of the independent claims as being unpatentable over Zellweger in view of Wical was discussed. The Applicant argued that Wical pulls up an entire document that meets the definition of a theme as opposed to the claimed invention that requires the return of only portions of a document. No agreement concerning the references was reached. However, it was agreed that the Applicant has until Wednesday February 22 at 5 pm to file a supplemental amendment.